



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,460	09/18/2000	Robert Ellis Chapman JR.	YOR920000625US1	4303

7590 10/20/2005

Anne V. Dougherty Esq.
3173 Cedar Road
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER

SHARMA, SUJATHA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2684

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/664,460	Applicant(s) CHAPMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Sujatha Sharma	Art Unit 2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 18-20 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 18-20, 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3,6,8-10,22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto [US 5,255,308].

Regarding claims 1,22 and 23, Hashimoto discloses a method of receiving a group call to all the cordless extensions in the group. Hashimoto further discloses:

- a network node device (3 in Fig.1) for connecting one or more telephone wirelines to one or more wireless connections for receiving incoming calls each specifying a telephone number (See Fig.1);
- one or more wireless signal generators (4 in Fig 1) supporting one or more wireless connections to one or more wireless devices (see Fig.1);
- one or more controllable interconnection between the telephone wirelines and wireless signal generator (see Fig.1 and summary of invention);
- a method of associating a called telephone number with at least two wireless devices and means for alerting the at least two wireless devices associated with the called telephone number of the incoming call (see col. 4, lines 30-57);
- means for accepting one of the said wireless devices as the answerer to the first incoming call and means for directing the second incoming call to the same single number to one of

Art Unit: 2684

the other wireless devices associated with that telephone number while the first call is in progress. See summary of invention and col. 4, lines 30-57.

Regarding claim 2, Hashimoto further discloses the network node device to comprise one or more computational elements that control said controllable interconnection (see col.2, line 55-col. 3, line 59).

Regarding claim 3, Hashimoto further discloses the network control unit to include processors and memory for controllable interconnections between the wireline and wireless devices (see col.4, lines 40-59).

Regarding claim 6, Hashimoto further discloses the network control unit to include wireline telephony signal generators (see fig. 1).

Regarding claim 8, Hashimoto discloses a method where the information stored includes a connection process to control interconnections of the network control unit between wireline and wireless signal generators (See summary of invention and col. 4, lines 30-57, Fig.1).

Regarding claim 9, Hashimoto further discloses a method where the controllable interconnection is non-blocking (See summary of invention and col. 4, lines 30-57, Fig.1).

Regarding claim 10, Hashimoto further discloses a method where the controllable interconnection is any to any (see Fig.1).

Regarding claim 24, Hashimoto further discloses a method for selecting one wireless signal method to be used between the node device and the at least two wireless devices. See col. 3, lines 40-51 and Fig. 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4,5,7,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto [US 5,255,308] in view of Antonello [US 5,862,469].

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Hashimoto discloses all the limitations as claimed. However he does not disclose the memory in the network control unit to include long-term storage for information

Antonello, in the same field of endeavor, teaches the use of memory in the network control unit to include long-term storage for information (see col. 4, lines 60-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Antonello to Hashimoto in order to carry out successful call processing.

Regarding claim 7, Antonello further discloses a method of generating DTMF tones (see fig. 2).

Regarding claim 11, Antonello further discloses a method where the interconnection is a bus (SEE Fig.1).

5. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto [US 5,255,308] in view of Chambers [US 5,867,485].

Regarding claims 18-20, Hashimoto as treated in claim 1 does not disclose the network node device to comprise of a power supply and the power supply comprising of trickle battery charger and further the battery charger connected to solar cells.

Chambers in the same field of endeavor teaches a system with network node devices and network interface units to replace the last mile fiber/coaxial/twisted pair loop to the curb line wireline networks from residences and/or businesses. Chambers further teaches the method of supplying power to the network interface unit to feed the various components of the unit along with a battery backup. Chambers further teaches the use of solar panels that are used to trickle charge the battery when not in use. See Figures 1 and 4 and column 9, lines 40-50.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the above teachings of Chambers to Hashimoto in order to power the components of the network node for optimal operation and further use the battery backup when power is interrupted.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 12/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the analogy of the radio control unit in Hashimoto reference and the claimed network node is improper.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. It should be noted the claim does not call for all the features inside the node but the language of the claim calls for "network node comprises of". Further the wireless signal generator(unit 4, in fig. 1) is directly connected to the network node and therefore is part of the network node.

The applicant argues that the primary reference fails to teach the key feature in the invention i.e. associating the single called telephone number with at least two wireless devices and means for alerting the at least two wireless devices associated with the single called number of a first incoming call from an originating device which is not one of the at least two wireless devices associated with the single called number.

The applicant is again drawn to the Hashimoto reference where it teaches a group call method but has essentially the same features as the claimed invention as stated above. Hashimoto discloses a network node device (3 in Fig.1) for connecting one or more telephone wirelines to one or more wireless connections for receiving incoming calls each specifying a telephone number (See Fig.1); and means for accepting one of the said wireless devices as the answerer to the first incoming call and means for directing the second incoming call to the same single

Art Unit: 2684

number to one of the other wireless devices associated with that telephone number while the first call is in progress. See summary of invention and col. 4, lines 30-57.

The claim language does not distinguish between the prior art and the argued features. The claims are further given the broadest interpretation.


Therefore the rejection of the claims 1-11, 18-20, 22 and 23 as presented in the previous office action (mailed 9/10/04) and as discussed above is considered proper.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sujatha Sharma whose telephone number is 571-272-7886. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7.30am - 4.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sujatha Sharma
October 11, 2005


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER